

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

JAN 24 2008

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JORGE ROJAS GUTIERREZ; OLIVA
GONZALEZ GONZALEZ; JORGE
ROJAS GONZALEZ

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 06-73784

Agency Nos. A79-537-462
A79-537-463
A79-537-464

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted January 14, 2008**

Before: HALL, O'SCANNLAIN, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Jorge Rojas Gutierrez, Oliva Gonzalez Gonzalez, and their son Jorge Rojas

Gonzalez petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

(“BIA”) denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *see Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying the petitioners’ motion to reopen, where the BIA considered the evidence they submitted regarding their son and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to warrant reopening. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (The BIA’s denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is “arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law.”). Petitioners’ contention that the BIA failed to adequately explain its reasons for denying the motion to reopen is not supported by the record.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.